DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 331 029 CS 010 547

AUTHOR Ryan, Katherine E.; And Others
TITLE An Evaluation Framework for Family Literacy Programs.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (72nd, Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Family Programs; Intergenerational Programs; *Literacy; Models; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Family Literacy; Illinois

ABSTRACT

Because family literacy programs are new, the definition of such programs and program models are still evolving. Broadly speaking, two criteria differentiate family literacy programs from other literacy programs: (1) the program is conceptualized around the concerns of the family as a unit; and (2) there is, at minimum, an implied educational component for the child which directly or indirectly impact the child's literacy and at least one activity of the adult component focuses on adult and child interactions. The components of a conceptual structure for family literacy programs are: focus on child only; focus on adult only; focus on both adult and child; focus on family's utilization of community resources and social network; and focus on family economic self-sufficiency. Such a framework can provide direction for program development and evaluation while capturing the dynamic nature of the process. A critical element in program development is program evaluation. A five-tiered approach to family literacy program evaluation includes: (1) pre-implementation, more commonly known as needs assessment; (2) accountability, or program utilization; (3) program clarification, or formative or process evaluation; (4) progress towards objective; and (5) program impact. To demonstrate how this approach can be used by program providers, one program is examined within the evaluation framework. In response to an increasing emphasis in education on performance-based assessment, a portfolio of assessment can be put together instead of simply providing a summary of standardized test results. (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED331029

AN EVALUATION FRAMEWORK FOR FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS

Katherine E. Ryan, Ph.D.*
Division of Measurement and Evaluation
University of Illinois
307 Engineering Hall
1308 W. Green Street
Urbana, IL 61801

Suzanne Knell, Executive Director
Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center
200 South Frederick
Rantoul, IL 61866

Barbara Geissler, Assistant Director
Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center
200 South Frederick
Rantoul, IL 61866

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Katherine Ryan
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS010547

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*This work was completed while the first author was employed at Metritiech, Inc., Champaign, IL

INTRODUCTION

Issues associated with literacy or illiteracy have a major impact on U. S. economic, social, and educational institutions. In the United States, it is estimated that illiteracy costs the economy $225 billion annually in lost revenues, taxes, decreased industrial productivity, etc. Although efforts are made to combat illiteracy systematically, the U. S. is ranked 49th in literacy rate among all United Nations countries. It is estimated that 23-27 million U. S. citizens do not read above a 6th grade reading level. Nationally, 50% to 75% of the unemployed are considered to be functionally illiterate. Eight-five percent of the juvenile offenders in the United States are classified as illiterate as is 50% of the prison population. Approximately 30% of welfare mothers are also considered to be illiterate.

Illiteracy in Illinois mirrors the national problem. Illinois ranks a modest 34th in literacy rate among the 50 states. It is estimated that two million residents of Illinois read below a fifth-grade level. Thirty percent of welfare mothers are functionally illiterate. Seventy-five percent of the unemployed do not have adequate literacy skills, at an estimated cost of $800 million to taxpayers.

Historically, efforts to improve literacy have focused on the individual such as early childhood programs (preschool children), compensatory programs (elementary school children) and community-based literacy programs (adults). Although the efforts of these programs have been noteworthy, the impact of these programs have been disappointing (Association for Community Based Education, 1989).

To expand these efforts, several diverse traditions, adult education, early childhood education, and family support programs have intersected to address literacy issues in the United States (Sticht, 1989; Nickse, 1989). These programs, called family literacy programs are based on the fundamental notion that improving the parenting and basic skills of adults will foster learning among their children (MacGraw, 1989, Sticht, 1989). This approach is a significant departure from traditional thinking in illiteracy. The focus has shifted from the individual to a broader context and includes the family, culture, community, and social institutions in attempting to break the illiteracy link. Federal legislation, Even Start and the welfare reform act are supporting this initiative, and are providing an essential source of funding for these programs.

To examine family literacy programs in the State of Illinois, the MacArthur Foundation commissioned the Illinois Literacy Resource Development Project to conduct an exploratory investigation of these programs. This paper reports on a portion of this project. The purpose of this report is to provide a definition of family literacy programs, present a conceptual structure for describing the program components and goals, and to propose a framework for systematically incorporating evaluation within these programs.

Because family literacy programs are new, the definition and program models are still evolving (MacGraw, 1989; Weiss, 1988;). The term "intergenerational" literacy program is also used. Nickse (1989) indicates the "intergenerational" terminology becomes confusing. As she points out, in some cases, the terms "intergenerational" and "family" are used interchangably to describe literacy programs serving adults and children from the same family. In contrast, in other

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

literacy programs, "intergenerational" is defined as someone older (a volunteer) tutoring someone younger (a middle school student). The library programs where children work with volunteers from the community are an example.

Nickse (1989) presents a conceptual framework that encompasses both family literacy and intergenerational programs, irrespective of the relationship between the younger and older person. She joins family literacy and intergenerational programs by specifically recommending the term "adult" (meaning the adult does not have to be a family or extended family member) so the model will have this broad application. For instance, the library programs described above can be considered within this framework.

She proposes these programs can be classified on these two dimensions:

1. type of participant (adult, child)
2. degree of intervention (direct or indirect).

The degree of intervention refers to "whether or not the adult and the child are present together for literacy development any or all of the time" (Nickse, 1989; p, 29). The individuals who are the focus of the service are the "primary" participants (receiving direct services). The "secondary" participants benefit indirectly. For type of participant, the adult is the older person and the child is the younger person. Broadening the definition and conceptual basis of these programs as Nickse does in her framework may not decrease the confusion. Thus, "family" literacy programs rather than the more global "intergenerational" literacy programs will be the focus of the report. Broadly speaking, we suggest two criteria differentiate family literacy programs from other literacy programs:

> the program is conceptualized around the concerns of the family as a unit in contrast to serving only an individual family member.
>
> there is, at a minimum, an implied educational component for the child which directly or indirectly impacts the child's literacy and at least one activity of the adult component focuses on adult and child interactions.

Family is defined as the significant others identified by the person or persons participating in the program. Within these criteria, the library program described above is not a family literacy program unless the persons participating are "family" as just defined.

There is no empirical research for defining quality family literacy programs (Nickse, 1989). However, elaborating MacGraw (1989), we propose a targeted definition for family literacy programs which is distinguished by the following characteristics.

> The program is conceptualized around the concerns of the family as a unit in contrast to serving only an individual family member.
>
> Program components are developed on the basis of the community needs assessment and participant recommendation.
>
> Adults who need to improve their literacy skills and the child or children for whom they are responsible are the target population.

Parenting education is offered and literacy activities are provided so adults can attain a level of proficiency in basic skills that is sufficient to meet individuals' goals and social and economic demands for proficiency.

Literacy, pre-literacy, and developmentally appropriate activities for children are provided.

There are formal and/or informal activities with varying degrees of systematic adult and child interactions focusing on parents as teachers.

The programs serves as a liaison with community agencies which focus their resources in basic problems faced by the families.

These characteristics ground the program in the context of the community, target the program mission, and specifies five goal areas for family literacy programs. However, using all these characteristics as criteria, within the state of Illinois, very few literacy program could be classified as family literacy programs.

Weiss (1988), in providing a broad conceptual structure for family education programs incorporates most of these program components. Elaborating Weiss (1988), we propose the conceptual structure presented in Figure 1 for family literacy programs. The program components are outlined below:

Child Only: This program component targets the child. Educational services are provided to a child or children between the ages of 0 to 16. Traditionally the goal has been on enhancing children's pre-academic or academic skills. Presently goals are specified in all areas of development. Such educational services may include birth to toddler, pre-kindergarten, elementary or secondary programs or activities.

Adult Only: The adult is the focus of this component with services offered to adults from the ages of 16 to 99. Goals here are developing literacy skills, improving self-esteem, etc. Services might include: ABE, GED, ESL, job integrated, parenting classes, book reading, and related specific literacy classes.

Adult and Child: This component is a distinguishing feature in family literacy programs where goals include improving the child's, the adult's, or the child and adult's skills and abilities. It is assumed either explicitly or implicitly that the skills the adult and child learn or practice produces an intergenerational transfer and/or reciprocal transfer of skills and abilities. The emphasis is on the parents as teachers of their children and/or parenting skills. The adult is usually the same adult in the adult only component and must be a significant other included within the definition of the family.

Community Resources and Social Network: This component targets the family's utilization of community resources and development of social

networks. Community resource goals would include learning to use medical resources, day care, etc. Social networks include goals in the area of intra-familial relations, friendships, to support family concerns.

Family Economic Self-Sufficiency: Family economic self-sufficiency is the focus in this component. Facilitating adaptation to the job market and economic environment are goals. Activities range along a continuum from job readiness assistance to job skill enhancement.

With Weiss (1988), we recognize the evolutionary nature of this field, and suggest it is more likely that a single program may have goals in one or two of the areas and is moving towards incorporating the other two or three program components. However, the conceptual framework specified above provides direction for program development and evaluation while capturing the dynamic nature of this process.

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK FOR FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS

A critical element in program development is program evaluation. Theoretically, program evaluation is supposed to be used by the program providers, program administrators, legislators, and funding agencies as a guide for program direction and development, and in determining program effectiveness. When considering evaluation approaches, the age and development of the field should be examined. For instance, after decades of research, there are elaborate theories of reading comprehension and recommendations for best practices for children (Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, & Wilkinson, 1985). In contrast, family literacy programs are a new area of investigation. As pointed out earlier, what constitutes a family literacy program has not been determined (McGraw, 1989). Treatment techniques are still being developed. There have not been a sufficient number of empirical investigations conducted to suggest "best practices". Because of the "state of the art" in family literacy programs, by definition, the evaluation of family programs can be characterized as formative in nature.

These issues have implications for planning the evaluations of family literacy programs. No specific evaluation approach can be recommended as appropriate for all family literacy programs. Rather the program structure, natural life cycle, funding levels have to be considered. An approach that can be fitted to each individual program rather than fitting the individual program to the design is essential for conducting systematic, yet useful program evaluations of family literacy programs.

Despite the fact that family literacy programs are relatively new, evaluations of family literacy programs are potentially a rich source of information about adult-child relations, cultural differences in these relations, which strategies are effective with which types of families, best practices in family programs, (Powell, 1987).

Jacobs, (1988) has developed what she call the five-tiered approach to family program evaluation. She identifies five levels of evaluation activities with each level theoretically requiring an increasing sophistication in data collection and organization, and specificity of program definition. We conceptualize this approach as developmental and suggest that an adaptation of this approach be considered for the evaluation of family literacy programs.

A distinct advantage with this approach is that programs can be engaged in different levels of evaluation within different program components and in different goal areas at the same time. For instance, a program may be at the formative evaluation level for the child-only and adult-only components. However, if they do not have a adult-child component, they may implement level one as a first step in the development of that program component. Figure 1 outlines this evaluation framework in relationship to a family literacy program.

Such a framework can also be considered in relationship to the typical steps specified and carried out in the evaluation process. Figure 2 provides a summary of the evaluation framework in relationship to the steps in the evaluation process. For each level, the following steps will be addressed within each level.

Purpose of the evaluation
Evaluation questions
Audiences
Evaluation tasks/strategies
Types of data to collect/analyze
Interpretation and dissemination of findings
Program planning

Level One-Preimplementation Tier

This phase is more commonly known as a needs assessment. The guiding question here is "What is the problem?" The purpose is to document that there is a need for particular services for a specific population within the community. The audience includes but is not limited to funding agencies, citizens in the community, and the potential participants.

Obviously, if a program is funded, on some level, this phase has been implemented. However, if the program was established for political reasons, a systematic procedure establishing the problem, defining the target population, a description of services to be provided, and what the intended benefits are, may not have been carried out. When the needs assessment has been completed, it provides the first step in the evaluation process. However, if the problem or the target population, etc. has not been defined, the evaluation cannot be focused. Therefore, if a needs assessment was not carried out prior to program initiation, it is worthwhile to make sure this phase of the evaluation is completed.

Evidence of the problem is usually documented through local demographics, a review of local press coverage, interviews with key community leaders, or surveying the community. For example, if intergenerational literacy was considered to be a problem in a community, here are a set of steps suggested by Jacobs (1988) that could be used to carry out the needs assessment.

1. Locate local demographics that indicate the presence of the problem. These can be supplemented with national or local statistics that indicate what the consequences these problems are for the community, state, and nation. For instance, there are national statistics suggesting 30% of all welfare mothers do not have adequate literacy skills, 85% of the juvenile defenders are functionally illiterate, etc.

2. Review local and national press coverage of the problem. (Intergenerational

literacy has been covered on television and in the press.)

3. Interview community leaders (the mayor, day care directors,) on the subject. In addition, it is essential to seek interviews with the community leaders of the populations the program will serve and garner their support (Edwards, 1989). The community leaders for families with low literacy skills may not be the mayor and the police chief.

4. Describe your program in writing. Elements to include are:

> The population to be served: preschoolers and their families, or middle-school children and their families, or who.
>
> What will happen to these families as a result of receiving services. (Adults will read to their children at home more frequently.)
>
> Types of services to be offered, by whom, and at what cost. (Services to the adult, and child individually and together or services will be provided to the parent and child together only by trained volunteers or professionals.)
>
> Specify the intended benefits and do not promise more than can be delivered. (Adults will seek or maintain employment; adult self-esteem will improve, children will like school more.)

A major problem in any type of evaluation is the interpretation and dissemination of the findings. Not only are findings often contradictory, they may not be utilized. However, a summary report highlighting key findings to the audience is essential. It is equally important that the language of the report or summary is accessible to the audience. Graphs and figures are often an excellent illustrations of key findings. The implications for program planning are obvious. It is unlikely that the original program proposal will be perfectly fitted to the findings of the needs assessment. Therefore an adjustment in program planning based on the findings from the needs assessment is warranted.

Level Two-Accountability Tier

This level has traditionally been known as program utilization. At this stage, the answer to "Who are we serving and what services are we providing?" is addressed. The audience is again funding agencies, but the program providers and participants can also be considered part of the audience.

In this phase, data is collected on participant characteristics and service use. Theoretically all programs should be conducting the accountability tier of the evaluation process. This type of data provides evidence about whether the targeted participants is being served or not, can provide guidance for changes within the program to the provider, and can be used to maintain current levels of funding or secure additional funds for program expansion. Some of the approaches to address these issues are as follows:

1. Document the number of individuals served,

2. Estimate the portion of the population defined that is using the services.

3. Determine who is participating in what services.

4. Document who is providing services to the participants.

5. Determine program costs.

In the case of family literacy programs, suppose the target participants are adults who are in need of basic skills and their children. Participant data indicates that a significant portion of the participants require ESL instruction. This finding implies that either the target population may need to be re-defined, additional services should be offered, and additional recruiting efforts are needed to enroll families who require instruction in basic literacy skills . Such information is key in documenting the need for additional services and may be critical in obtaining the funds to provide it. Formal presentations of this type of information to funding agencies and staff as well as followup after the report are approaches to disseminating the findings. Persistence is important to making sure action is taken as a result of the findings.

(See Littell (1986) for information and example forms on how to document the number of individuals served and services to clients, determining program costs, determination of participants' characteristics, etc.)

Level Three-Program Clarification Tier

This stage is more commonly recognized as formative or process evaluation. Data are collected from the staff and participants. The guiding question during this phase is "how can we do a better job serving our participants?" (Jacobs, 1988; p,57). The audience are staff members,and program participants. Funding agencies may be another segment of the audience at this stage. Program structure and focus are critically examined. Some of the typical methods to implement this phase are outlined below.

1. Develop written questionnaires targeting participant satisfaction.

2. Conduct personal interviews with participants.

3. Conduct telephone interviews with participants.

Continuing with our hypothetical program, such data might indicate that for a segment of the population, an afternoon family literacy program would be ideal rather than the evening program which is the only one currently offered. The implications for program planning are obvious. Besides program staff and participants, it may be helpful to share results with other program providers. (See Patton, 1980 for an excellent discussion on how to plan and conduct interviews.)

Program goals and objectives are also specified or reviewed during this phase. Walker and Mitchell (1988) recommend what they call a typology of program objectives as a framework for this review. (See Walker and Mitchell, 1988 for an extended discussion of a typology of program objectives.)

Their scheme is outlined below:

1. Process objectives: how and what staff will do to achieve program goals.(e.g.recruiting approaches, retention strategies)

2. Product objectives: what materials staff will develop (e.g. family literacy curriculum, family literacy assessment constructed).

3. Outcome objectives: how participants will change as a result of program participation.(e.g. participants will obtain employment, engage in adult and child book reading)

4. Impact objectives: what are the long term results of the program (e.g. retention rate in high school will increase)

Participants can be a rich source of information and feedback in the specification and review of objectives. It offers them the opportunity to develop their own literacy program allowing program providers to serve as a guide in helping participants make progress towards their goals.

Level Four-Progress-toward-Objectives Tier

At this stage, short-term program effectiveness objectives are specified and reviewed to see whether they have been achieved. The guiding question is "Are the participants making progress?" Progress includes but is not limited to behaviors, attitudes, knowledge, etc. The audience is funding agencies, program participants, community members, program providers, and perhaps an external review committee. Programs which have been operating for an extended period of time with substantial financial resources would implement this phase of the evaluation process.

In contrast to the accountability tier, here the focus is on participant progress, not on whether the program is being provided. This phase is characterized by three distinct elements. In general, program objectives are measured objectively. Secondly, the program is held responsible for participant progress. Last, the program has the resources to involve staff in instrument development, administration of standardized instruments, sophisticated data collection procedures, and interpretation of results. Professional evaluators are often engaged at this stage to design this phase of the evaluation and to help staff implement it. Typical approaches in this phase are specified below.

1. Administer standardized instruments.

2. Construct surveys or skill inventories to measure specific skill development.

3. Review and content analysis of anecdotal records.

4. Document analysis of program records.

5. Develop standard, structured or non-standard unstructured interviews.

For a family literacy program, measures of achievement for adults and children would be administered on a pretest-posttest basis to evaluate program effects. If an increase in adult self-esteem is a goal, a standardized measure of self-esteem could be administered and/or an interview could be designed to administer to adults prior to program enrollment and after a significant period of time as a program participant. While historically evaluation approaches have emphasized objective, standard measures at this stage, qualitative approaches to data collection are also critical to conducting useful evaluations to flesh out, or provide insights into the results from standardized instruments.

The findings again should be shared with the appropriate audience through a report and/or formal presentation. Dissemination of results at local, state-wide, and national conferences and workshops are also appropriate at this phase. Because of the age of literacy programs and the particular structure (many small local programs), it is critical evaluation findings be made available to interested parties.

(See Fink and Kosecoff, 1985 on survey and scale construction, Patton 1980 for a complete discussion of document and content analysis, Denzin, (1989a,b) for non-standard, unstructured interviews and an extensive discussion of survey errors).

Level Five-Program Impact Tier

At this stage, the program has operated for a considerable length of time and successfully implemented the first four tiers and is committed to an experimental or quasi-experimental approach to evaluate program effects. The guiding question is "what are the long-term effects of program participation?". Treatments are clearly specified with intensive data collection strategies involving multi-year efforts. Although this phase provides feedback to the program, there is likely to be an external component to the evaluation reporting. At this level, there are attempts to provide evidence of differential effectiveness or recommend program models for replication. In addition, the program could theoretically have been provided services to look for program impact at the community level, e.g. a change in local employment statistics might be a potential outcome measure. The methods used at this stage are described below.

1. Treatment partitioning (examining three day versus five day programs.

2. Longitudinal studies (following groups of participants for an extended period during and after program participation)

3. Observational studies (proposed causal models that are analyzed with powerful statistical methods)

Again, traditionally quantitative methods are employed in this phase of the evaluation. However, in an effort to "unpack program processes" qualitative approaches can and should be used in conjunction with the quantitative approaches.

4. Conduct case studies following a group of participants who are representative of the targeted population at one or several sites.

5. Ethnography which involves participant observation by the evaluator ni the program.

Returning to the family literacy program example, a program might be examining the intensity levels of intervention. These differential treatments might be comparing the effects of three versus five day family literacy programs or alternatively all day versus a half day programs. These findings are disseminated to the funding agencies and presented at local, state-wide, and national conferences and workshops.

(See Campbell and Stanley, (1963) and Cook and Campbell (1979) for the seminal discussion of experimental and quasi-experimental designs, Joreskog and Sorbom (1988) for statistical methods used in observational studies. See further Denzin, 1989a,b and Patton, 1980 for extensive discussions about the problems with the experimental and quasi-experimental approach to evaluation. See Denzin, 1989a for an extensive discussion of qualitative methods, in general including ethnography and case study.)

EXAMPLE

To demonstrate how this approach might be used by program providers to look at their programs, one programs is examined within the evaluation framework. (The name of this program is fictitious to protect the confidentiality of the program.) The program description, including size, location, and type as well as how the program fits within the evaluation framework is described below.

Program Description:

OPTIONS is a family literacy program located in a mid-sized central Illinois city. The literacy providers for the program are the community junior college and an adult education program in a smaller town 15 miles from the city. OPTIONS was designed to provides literacy services to the individuals at two distinct sites: a woman's shelter for the homeless and another women's shelter for victims of domestic violence. The two shelters provided literacy services to 48 women and their children in the first six months of 1990.

A unique feature of this project is the short-term nature of the intervention. While women and children have resided up to six months at the shelters, in general, the length of residence and thus participation. This program is a first step in showing families a range of opportunities they have. The program is committed to introducing educational and work opportunities to the women, promoting family literacy activities, and providing educational services to their children. The adults have the opportunity to participate in short-term reading instruction, receive instruction in reading readiness for their children. While there are no formal activities for the adult-child component, it is assumed the adult activities will promote parents as teachers of their children.

Level 1: Needs Assessment

In reviewing the OPTIONS proposal for funding, a problem statement, the population to be served, types of services to be offered and will provide these services is described in detail. Local demographics and anecdotal records were used provide evidence of the problem. In addition, the program goals, the objectives to meet these goals, and a workplan for each objective is specified.

Therefore, the basic structure for evaluating the program is in place.

Level 2: Accountability

To document that the program is being provided, several instruments have been developed. Information on participant characteristics, program exit and entry, reasons for leaving,etc are documented on the OPTIONS Client Information Sheet. To document program participation, the number of hours and services provided for each participant is documented on the Educational Services Daily Log. While the services to children are scheduled, participation in these services is not documented.

Level 3: Formative Evaluation

Anecdotal information from staff and personal comments from participants is the primary method, at present, for determining client satisfaction. A short questionnaire to complete or interview for families upon exit is a source of information about participant satisfaction that is more completely documented.

Program goals and objectives are also reviewed or specified at this stage of the evaluation. In the case of OPTIONS, the program goals and objectives were established for the funding proposal.

Level 4: Progress-towards-objectives

The Client's Information Sheet contains information about participant assessment, the objectives set with the client and whether the client completed or even participated in activities to meet the objectives. This demonstrates a key issue when working with families. Simply participating in literacy activities may be a major step forward for some participants and should be considered progress. The Quarterly Report summarizes how many participants made progress in the educational and / or economic goals they set.

As part of their on-going efforts, a method of follow-up to determine what happens to the participant's educational / economic plans is being considered. Networks with local literacy and training agencies are being set up to see how may women enroll, participate, and complete programs in order to implement their educational and economic plans. this type of information represents concrete evidence of program success. In addition, it allows providers to investigate which stategies seem to be successful and /or unsuccessful.

DEVELOPING AN ASSESSMENT SYSTEM FOR EVALUATION

While there are major questions and concerns at all phases of the evaluation process, assessment is or will become the most controversial issue in family literacy. This is not surprising because family literacy programs have inherited all the assessment issues from adult literacy, early childhood education, and family support programs and perhaps from education in general that have never been satisfactorily resolved. While these assessment issues are not so much of a concern at Levels 1, 2, and most of 3, for Levels 4 and 5, how to define progress, operationalize it, and what represents significant progress has not been clarified.

In response to this, in education, there is an increasing emphasis on performance-based assessment, which is "formative, productive, and process-oriented, not an end to itself" (Zumwaldt, 1990). However, Wolfe (1990) warns training in this approach and that the proper climate in the instructional setting is key to implementing a performance-based assessment system. This approach is clinical rather than psychometric where it is on-going during and outside of instruction and is continual. Wolfe (1990) characterizes this as a "chorus of assessments" with "numerous episodes of assessments." This approach is largely developmental, not rank-oriented. The assessment system is open-ended composed of a variety of assessment approaches with multiple criteria to be met. The assessment is carried out by more than one person based on reliable judgement and is subject to re-alignment. It is essential that the system be practical and integrated into the curriculum.

Sterling (1989) has recommended what he call an alternative assessment model in adult literacy. Briefly, this approach consists of a beginning assessment, on-going assessment, and an exit assessment. Each component consists of a series in-depth questions that are qualitative in nature. These questions are designed to tailor a program specific to participants interests, goals, and strengths and to focus on participants application of metacongitive strategies to literacy tasks.

We recommend that a combination of these two approaches be considered when a family literacy program is designing an assessment system. Rather than simply providing a summary of standardized test results, a portfolio of the assessments can be put together.

1. Each portfolio would contain specific required samples to allow normative comparisons

2. Work sample selected by the instructor.

3. Work selected by the participant.

Each area would have specific performance objectives put together by the participant and instructor based on the participants' goals. For instance, here is a set of objectives that might be developed by the participant and instructor.

Goal 1: To improve participants's functional literacy skills in reading and writing. (adult)

Goal 2: To help child become a more strategic reader through the help of the child's parent.(adult-child component)

a. Participant will read newspaper articles, novels, children's literature job applications, textbooks, cookbooks, and poetry of interest to the participant. (adult)

b. Participant will write summaries and / or evaluations of newspaper articles, novels, children's literature, job applications, textbooks, cookbooks, and poetry the participant has read. (adult)

c. Participant will increase the amount of time spent reading and /or story telling to the participant's child. (adult-child)

d. Participant will become aware of reading strategies (prediction, topic familiarity, questioning, re-telling) to use to help the participant's child become a more strategic reader.

e. Participant will become more aware of reading strategies to use to help the participant's own strategic reading. To evaluate progress, a portfolio for a participant with the objectives specified above might contain the following samples:

1. Results of standardized test scores. (adult)

2. A dramatic poetry reading by the participant on audio tape.(adult)

3.Entry and exit information from a reading interest and usage survey.(adult)

4. A self-evaluation of reading and writing skills conducted by the participant in the contexts defined, i.e. novels, children's literature,etc.(adult)

5. Written evaluation of participant reading and writing strengths and weaknesses by instructor and peers in the contexts defined.(adult)

6. Demonstrations of strategies the participant uses to deal with literacy tasks with the participants own reading and their children's reading with video or through instructor and peer observation. (adult, adult-child)

Such a portfolio could be designed for any goal area such as math, self-concept, etc.